

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2008. Applicant has amended claims 1, 12 and 13, cancelled claims 4, 7, 10 and 11, and added claims 17-19. Applicant has filed two Terminal Disclaimers with this Response. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for all payments due in connection with this Response.

Double Patenting

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13 and 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Design Patent No. D515,386. The Office Action further rejected claim 13 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Design Patent No. D514,914. For purposes of advancing the prosecution of this application, Applicant has elected to overcome such rejection through the enclosed Terminal Disclaimers. Such election shall not be deemed an admission as to the propriety or accuracy of the Office Action's conclusions or rejections.

The Office Action objected to claim 4 on the ground of statutory "same invention" type double patenting as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. Applicant has cancelled claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action noted that claim 16 would be allowable if the double patenting rejections are overcome. The double patenting rejections have been overcome for the reasons set forth above.

The Office Action noted that claims 7 and 10-12 would be allowable if Applicant overcomes the double patenting rejections and if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The double patenting rejections have been overcome for the reasons set forth above. Each of objected claims 7, 10 and 11 depended from rejected claim 3, which depended from rejected independent claim 1. Objected Claim 12 depended from objected claim 11, which depended from rejected claim 3, which depended from rejected independent claim 1.

Applicant has: (a) added new independent claim 17 to include the elements of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 7; (b) added new independent claim 18 to include the elements of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 10; and (c) added new independent claim 19 to include the elements of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 11. Further, Applicant has amended claim 12 to depend from claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claims 17, 18 and 19, and dependent claim 12, are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action noted that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 would be allowable if Applicant overcomes the double patenting rejections and also include the limitation --that passes through the articulation pin-- inserted between "sections" and "is" in the seventh line of the first claim. The double patenting rejections have been overcome for the reasons set forth above, and Applicant has added such element to claim 1.

The Office Action further noted that claim 13 would be allowable if amended to recite that "the hook has a pivot axis that is perpendicular to the arm pivot axis" in line 16 of claim 13. Applicant has amended independent claim 13 as suggested by the Office Action.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Renato L. Smith
Reg. No. 45,117
Customer No. 24573

Dated: May 2, 2008